SD

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,351	04/06/2001	Niakam Kazemi	363	1712

47372	7590	01/13/2005

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 100 EAST
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042-1248

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Office Action Summary	09/828,351	KAZEMI, NIAKAM
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Cam Y T Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-26* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14 in the amendment filed on

10/1/2004.

Claims 1-26 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Abstract

2.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of
the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single
paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is
important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space
provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The
form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and
"said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure
sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the
full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat
information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied,
such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention,"
"The disclosure describes," etc.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 1- 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the language of

the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an

abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which

would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible

result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

As regarding to:

Claim 1 recites " a symptom data entity storing symptoms, which are

observable states indicative of a defect, of manufacturing process defects; a

defect data entity storing defects of the manufacturing process; and an action

data entity storing repair actions for remedying related defects" and do not

positively recite that the method is processed by a computer or a machine so as

to realize its functionality.   Thus, claim 1 is merely abstract idea and being

processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts and

without computer manipulation.

Claims 2-13 claim "the manufacturing quality information database" and

do not positively recite that the method is processed by a computer or a machine.

Thus, the claimed invention is considered as non-functional descriptive material

and is not directed to a computer or a manufacture article.

Claim 14 recites "storing symptoms, which are observable states

indicative of a defect, of manufacturing process defects in a symptom data entity;

storing defects of the manufacturing process in a defect data entity; and storing

repair actions for remedying related defects in an action data entity" and do not

positively recite that the method is processed by a computer or a machine so as

to realize its functionality.   Thus, claim 1 is merely abstract idea and being

processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts and

without computer manipulation.

Claims 15-26 claim "the method of using a manufacturing quality

information database" and do not positively recite that the method is processed

by a computer or a machine. Thus, the claimed invention is considered as non-

functional descriptive material and is not directed to a computer or a manufacture

article.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-6, 12, 14-19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being by Jujiwara et al (or hereinafter "Jujiwara") (US 6801822).

As to claims 1 and 14, Jujiwara teaches a manufacturing quality

information database stored in a computer-readable medium and usable for

tracking quality information relating to a manufacturing process (fig. 10, col. 10,

lines 45-52), comprising:

"a symptom data entity storing symptoms, which are observable states

indicative of a defect, of manufacturing process defects" as nature of defect 1

stores states indicative of a defect, e.i. earth lead, abnormal image, vertical white

stripe and paper end could not turn on (figs. 131 & 108);

"a defect data entity storing defects of the manufacturing process" as

defective item stores defects of manufacturing process (figs. 31A-31F);

"an action data entity storing repair actions for remedying related defects"

as repair contents entity stores repair actions such as exchanges, revision for

related defect (fig. 131);

" said defect data entity being associated with said symptom data entity"

as defective item is associated with nature of defect 1 (fig. 131);

"said action data entity being associated with said defect data entity" as

repair contents is associated with defective item (fig. 131).

As to claims 2 and 15, Jujiwara teaches the manufacturing quality

information database (figs. 10&131, col. 10, lines 45-52)

"wherein said manufacturing quality information database tracks a plurality

of manufacturing processes" as shown in fig. 131,

"the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: a

process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as process

or processing names entity stores names, i.e., image check 01, completion check

01 as identities of the manufacturing processes (fig. 39);

"said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data

entity being associated with said process data entity" as natural of defect 1 entity,

defective item entity, repair contents entity are associated with processing name

entity (fig. 131).

As to claims 3 and 16, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"wherein said manufacturing quality information database track a plurality

of manufactured items" as tracking a plurality of machines (fig. 112);

"the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: an

item data entity storing identities of manufactured items" as machine number

entity stores machine numbers of manufactured machines (fig. 112);

"said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data

entity being associated with said item data entity" as natural of defect 1 entity,

defective item entity and repair of content entity are associated with machine

number entity (fig. 131).

As to claims 4 and 17, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a symptom category data entity for storing symptom categories of

manufacturing defects" as data item entity stores different types of natural of

defects such as nature of defect 1 entity, nature of defect 2 entity. Each natural

of defect entity stores different natural of defect; thus, data item store different

natural of defects. Data item entity is represented as a symptom category data entity. Nature of defect 1 and natural of defect 2 are represented as categories of manufacturing defects (fig. 14);

" said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as nature of defect 1 entity is associated with data item entity (figs. 14 &131).

As to claims 5 and 18, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"wherein said manufacturing quality information database tracks a plurality of manufacturing processes" as (fig. 131),

"a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as process or processing names entity stores names, i.e., image check 01, completion check 01 as identities of the manufacturing processes (fig. 39);

"the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as (fig. 39)

" a process/symptom frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the manufacturing process identifies" as the number of defects entity is represented as a process/symptom frequency data (fig. 110).

As to claims 6 and 19, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as items entity stores defective item entity.   Since

defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76).

As to claims 12 and 25, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as data item entity stores different types of natural of defects such as nature of defect 1 entity, nature of defect 2 entity. Each natural of defect entity stores different natural of defect; thus, data item store different natural of defects. Data item entity is represented as a symptom category data entity. Nature of defect 1 and natural of defect 2 are represented as categories of manufacturing defects (fig. 14);

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76);

"said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as nature of defect 1 entity is associated with data item entity (figs. 14 &131).

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as items entity stores defective item entity.   Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76)

"said defect category entity being associated with said symptom category" as (figs. 14 &131).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Morioka (US 6611728).

As to claims 7 and 20 Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a symptom/defect frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the defect categories". Morioka teaches defect category and number of defect during process (figs. 31 &9).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Morioka's teaching of defect category and

number of defect during process to Fujiwara's system in order to repair defects of

product efficiently.

9.   Claims 8, 9, 13, 21-22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Fujiwara.

As to claims 8 and 21, Fujiwara discloses the claimed limitation subject

matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "an action category data entity

storing action categories; said action data entity being associated with said action

category data entity". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity store different type

of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action

repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repair content. Items

entity is associated with each repair content entity (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity

store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores

different action repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repairs

content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products in order

easily.

As to claims 9 and 22, Fujiwara discloses the claimed limitation subject

matter in claim 8, except the claimed limitation "a defect/action frequency data

entity observing a relationship frequency between the defect categories and the

action categories". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity stores the number of
defects that related to defective item and repair contents (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the
time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity
store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores
different action repair content. Thus, items entity stores different action repair
content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products that are
repair in order easily.

As to claims 13 and 26, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the
manufacturing process" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since
defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores
different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data
entity" as (figs. 76 &131).

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an action category data
entity storing action categories; said action data entity being associated with said
action category data entity". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity store
different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores
different action repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repair
content. Items entity is associated with each repair content (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity stores different action repair content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products that are repair in order easily.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dor et al (US 6744266).

Contact Information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
1/10/2005